

Members:

Rep. Thomas Kromkowski, Chairperson
Rep. Robert Behning
Rep. Kathy Richardson
Sen. Sue Landske
Sen. Billie Breaux
Sen. Becky Skillman
Sen. Allie Craycraft
James Barcome



CENSUS DATA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Legislative Services Agency

200 West Washington Street, Suite 301

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789

Tel: (317) 232-9588 Fax: (317) 232-2554

LSA Staff:

Robert Rudolph, Attorney for the Committee
Beverly Holloway, Analyst for the Committee

Authority: IC 2-5-19

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: September 22, 1998
Meeting Time: 10:30 A.M.
Meeting Place: State House, 200 W. Washington St.,
Room 128
Meeting City: Indianapolis, Indiana
Meeting Number: 2

Members Present: Rep. Thomas Kromkowski, Chairperson; Rep. Robert Behning;
Rep. Kathy Richardson; Sen. Billie Breaux; Sen. Becky Skillman;
Sen. Allie Craycraft.

Members Absent: Sen. Sue Landske; James Barcome.

Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The Committee approved the Minutes of the August 13 meeting by consent.

State Election Division Presentation

The Chair recognized Mr. Brad King, Co-General Counsel, State Election Division to present two preliminary drafts.¹

1. Mr. King discussed Preliminary Draft (PD) 3293 and Preliminary Draft (PD) 3310. A copy of each of these drafts is on file in the Legislative Information Center, Room 230 of the State House, Indianapolis, Indiana. The telephone number of the Legislative Information Center is (317) 232-9856, and the mailing address is 200 W. Washington St., Suite 301, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789.

Mr. King first discussed PD 3293 concerning campaign finance reports. He noted that the draft clarifies the filing of campaign finance reports by candidates who are nominated by processes other than a primary election or a convention (see SECTION 1 and SECTIONS 3 through 6). He discussed the provisions relating to filing reports electronically (see SECTION 2). Mr. King explained that SECTIONS 7 through 9 of the draft related to the "large contribution" report. SECTION 7 amends the existing statute, clarifying when the report is due. He said that the new language in SECTION 7 also would permit a candidate to file a report early and to file an amended report covering subsequent large contributions by the due date. The amendment explicitly would provide for filing the report by fax. Senator Craycraft asked Mr. King whether permitting the filing of an amended large contribution report would give a candidate more time to file than the candidate otherwise would have. Mr. King assured the Committee that the same deadline would apply to amended reports. Mr. King told the Committee that SECTION 8 presents a different approach to filing large contribution reports, based on the federal procedure. Under SECTION 8, a candidate would not be required to file a large contribution report until the candidate had received a large contribution and would be required to file the report within 48 hours of receipt of the large contribution.

Mr. King turned to discussion of PD 3310. He summarized PD 3310 as the substance of HB 1174-1998 as amended by the latest conference committee report circulated for that bill during the 1998 session of the General Assembly. He reminded the Committee that HB 1174 consisted of several bills introduced during the 1998 Session, including topics relating to precincts in municipalities with universities, relating to school board elections in Tippecanoe County, and permitting certain municipalities to expand the size of their legislative bodies.

Senator Craycraft asked Mr. King to explain the function of poll "watchers". Mr. King responded that a "watcher" is an individual who is credentialed by a political party, a candidate, or a news organization whose function is to be present in the polling place to observe what occurs. A watcher has the right to observe proceedings and call attention to any violations of election law observed, but a watcher has no authority. There was discussion of the difference between a watcher and the members of an absentee traveling board. Mr. King observed that the members of an absentee board are more analogous to members of the precinct election board than to watchers.

Mr. King introduced, and the Chair recognized, Ms. Laurie Christie, Co-Director, Indiana Election Division. Ms. Christie reminded the Committee that effective January 1, 1999, Indiana law required the Election Division to develop "expenditure codes" for use by committees for reporting expenditures. (See IC 3-9-4-4.) Ms. Christie said that the Division sought guidance from the Committee and perhaps the General Assembly in developing those codes. Some models for reporting expenditures have not more than a dozen or so general categories to identify committee expenditures. Other coding schemes are very detailed and elaborate, containing maybe hundreds of different codes.

Senator Skillman noted that there are several private software vendors who provide accounting packages to candidates. She wondered whether there was any consistency among the different software packages relating to categorizing expenditures. Ms. Christie replied that there is a variation among the different packages. Representative Kromkowski said that he thought the Division should develop a coding system that was simple with a few broad categories. He said such a system would benefit both candidates and the public: Candidates would benefit because reporting would not be made more complicated and thereby be more accurate. The public would benefit because campaign finance reports would be easier to

understand.

Senator Craycraft asked whether introduction of a new coding system would adversely affect software vendors. He also suggested that perhaps Indiana should develop the reporting software to be used by candidates. Senator Skillman noted that good software vendors keep up with changes in the law and would alter software packages to reflect those changes.

Ms. Christie told the Committee that filing reports over the Internet is not too far away. Concerns about filing security are waning. Senator Craycraft observed that there are still many candidates and treasurers who are not comfortable with computers and he did not want electronic filing mandated unless the state would provide assistance in the form of software and training. Ms. Christie responded that some states do provide software to candidates but the political parties and large campaigns are not interested in using it. Mr. King reported that Indiana and Connecticut are among the leaders in providing campaign finance information electronically.

Mr. King introduced, and the Chair recognized, Ms. Kristi Robertson, Co-General Counsel, Indiana Election Division, to provide a report on voter registration. Ms. Robertson spoke about a roundtable forum held with various election officials regarding voter registration lists.² Ms. Robertson said that opinion was about evenly divided on the effectiveness of the duplicate registration elimination program. She said that opinion was unanimous that the national change of address (NCOA) program has not been successful and is not popular with election administrators. Working with the duplicate registration program and the NCOA program simultaneously has been frustrating. Ms. Robertson stated that two other ideas received support from the roundtable participants.

The first idea is a program for address confirmation and voter outreach. The state would send a mailing to all voters containing information about an upcoming election. Voters would not be required to respond to the mailing. However, election officials would obtain information from any mail returned as "undeliverable"; the names of individuals whose mailings were returned by the Post Office could be placed on the inactive list. Ms. Robertson said that this program could be implemented under current law if funding is provided.

The second idea would be to require a voter identification number that would be identical to the last four digits of an individual's Social Security Number. Such a requirement would not require revelation of the voter's Social Security Number, but the probability that two or more voters would share a name, birthday, and last four digits of a Social Security Number is so low that the number would be useful in eliminating duplicate registrations. Representative Behning asked whether it would not be just as effective to require use of a driver's license identification number. Ms. Robertson and some Committee members responded that not all voters will have a driver's license.

Representative Richardson showed Committee members examples of lists from the duplicate registration program and described how difficult it is for election officials to work effectively with all the information. A voter's name could be on several lists, each list requiring a different action to be taken by election officials with regard to names on that list. She also stated that the NCOA program is not very effective, citing as an example, that when a married couple has

2. Ms. Robertson distributed a list of the names of individuals participating. A copy of the list is on file with the Legislative Information Center (see footnote 1).

moved, only the name of the husband is returned by the NCOA, so the wife's name is not caught.

The Chair instructed Mr. King to work with the LSA to develop drafts relating to the expenditure codes question and the voter ID proposal.

Census Complete Count Information

The Chair told the Committee that he had received correspondence from Dr. Morton Marcus from the Indiana University School of Business relating to the 2000 Census and the complete count efforts being made. The Chair recognized Dr. Marcus to present this information.³

Dr. Marcus outlined the consequences of undercounting Indiana citizens in the national census. He said that he and his staff had calculated that a 1% undercount of the Indiana population would result in a \$250 million reduction in federal funds coming to Indiana. In addition, by using population projections currently available, Indiana is "on the bubble" with respect to retaining its tenth congressional seat. Dr. Marcus said that using current projections, Indiana's tenth congressional seat has priority number 431 in assignment if the 2000 Census is conducted as an actual enumeration. Under the method of "equal proportions" used for the last several apportionments, the last congressional seat assigned to any state has priority number 435. Dr. Marcus stated that if the current proposed sampling methodologies are used by the Census Bureau in conducting the 2000 Census, Indiana's tenth congressional seat will have priority number 436.

Dr. Marcus stated that he and his colleagues propose to develop a program with a budget of approximately \$250,000 to conduct a statewide campaign, involving various organizations, including local governments, to provide for a complete count of all Indiana's citizens. He said that a similar effort for the 1990 Census helped develop knowledge to assist the Census Bureau in correcting errors. Dr. Marcus said that his personal philosophy is that every citizen has not only a right to be counted but an obligation to be counted, if not for the reasons of good citizenship, then out of concern for the community and its interests.

Dr. Marcus discussed how the Census affects economic and other aspects of community life. He cited Richmond, Indiana as having a population not large enough to be metropolitan statistical area (MSA). Advertising and other economic factors are affected by how an area is classified under the census. A location obtains economic benefits from being an MSA. The City of Kokomo is in an MSA. Doctor Marcus asked whether Kokomo will be able to maintain that status after the 2000 Census.

Representative Behning said that he has been told that if the 2000 Census is conducted using sampling, it will be more advantageous to a community to have the actual count understated. Dr. Marcus said that he did not have adequate information to respond but he would never recommend an intentional undercount. Representative Behning stated that he has also heard that if the 2000 Census uses sampling, there will be no opportunity for local input to correct errors. Dr. Marcus said that he understands that there will be an opportunity for "minor

3. Dr. Marcus distributed information developed by his staff and information from the Census Bureau relating to the 2000 Census. A copy of each these materials is on file with the Legislative Information Center (see footnote 1).

interventions". Dr. Marcus also said that Indiana is late in working with the Census Bureau on address lists.

Senator Breaux observed that even with the best public relations and other programs to assure an accurate count, certain populations, such as the homeless would not respond to the Census. She asked if sampling is not a solution to that problem. Dr. Marcus acknowledged that it is impossible to motivate everyone to participate. However, using local knowledge as to where the homeless are located, for example, or how to appeal to populations likely to be undercounted, programs can be developed to find the homeless and count them and to reassure and encourage other populations to be counted.

Senator Craycraft commented that he thought that the long census form and the time it took for completion would discourage even more people from participating. Representative Behning asked Dr. Marcus if he thought \$250,000 was sufficient to mount a successful statewide advertising campaign. Dr. Marcus responded that the program would not directly buy advertising, but look for public service announcements, create local events to attract the media, and create local editorial content for the print media that emphasizes the local stake in assuring a complete count. The Chair asked Dr. Marcus to submit a proposal, including a budget, to the Committee.

Demonstration of the Block Boundary Suggestion Program Process

The Chair recognized Maureen Bard and Mark Stratton, Co-Managers of the Block Boundary Suggestion Program (BBSP).

Ms. Bard and Mr. Stratton presented slides illustrating the verification work of the BBSP.⁴ Slide 1 illustrates the addition of new geography (shown in white on the map) to the database through various Census Bureau programs, including the BBSP. Slide 2 illustrates a new development in Morgan County that was added to the electronic database through the BBSP. Slide 3 illustrates the extension of the line of Port Street to another visible feature. Slide 4 illustrates submission of any precinct lines to the Census Bureau that might not be held as census block lines. (See the lines in the circle on the map.) Ms. Bard explained that the consequence of the Census Bureau not holding the lines would result in combining population information for adjacent precincts, thus producing less accurate information relating to those precincts. Slide 5 illustrates the correction of road names on the electronic maps. Slide 6 illustrates input of correct address breaks on the maps relative to precinct boundaries. Slide 7 illustrates correction of incorrect township line data. Slide 8 illustrates the effects of municipal annexations on precinct lines in the data base.

Ms. Bard also submitted to the Committee information from the Census Bureau describing

4. Ms. Bard and Mr. Stratton discussed eight slides illustrating various aspects of the BBSP. The eight slides are sketch maps illustrating a portion of Hamilton County (slide 1), a portion of Morgan County (slide 2), a portion of Delaware County (slide 3), a portion of St. Joseph County (slide 4), a portion of Jasper County (slide 5), a portion of Marion County (slide 6), a portion of Delaware County (slide 7), and a portion of Lawrence County (slide 8). A copy of each these slides is on file with the Legislative Information Center (see footnote 1).

various programs for assisting communities in assuring a complete count.⁵

Next Meeting Date

The Chair set the Committee's next meeting date to be Tuesday, October 6 at 10:30 a.m. The Chair instructed staff to circulate to Committee members new and revised drafts that result from the meeting. He instructed staff to delete the material from PD 3310 relating to the Lake County combined board, explaining that he had not heard from those interested in Lake County whether the changes were still necessary.

Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:50 a.m.

5. A copy of these materials are on file with the Legislative Information Center (see footnote 1).